



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 16] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मई 31, 1986/ज्यैष्ठ 10, 1908
No. 16] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1986/JYAISTHA 10, 1908

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (iii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (iii)

(संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय अधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ
Orders and Notifications issued by Central Authorities (other than Administrations of Union
Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

नई दिल्ली, 1 मई 1986

आ.सं. 98:—भोक्त प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43)
की धारा 106 के अनुसरण में, निर्वाचन आयोग 1985 की निर्वाचन अर्जी
सं. 4 में उत्तर प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय इलाहाबाद के तारीख 21-12-1985
के आदेश को एनर्द्राएँ प्रकाशित करता है।

[सं. 82/उ.प्र./लो.स./4/85]

आदेश से,
एम.सी.जेन, सचिव

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 1st May, 1986

O.N. 98.—In pursuance of Section 106 of the
Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951),
the Election Commission hereby publishes the Order
dated 21st December, 1985 of the High Court of

238 GI/86 -1

Judicature at Allahabad in Election Petition No. 4
of 1985.

[No. 82/UP/HP/4/85]

By order,

S. C. JAIN, Secy.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
ALLAHABAD
CIVIL SIDE

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

Allahabad, the 21st December, 1985

PRESENT :

The Hon'ble R. A. Misra ...Judge

ELECTION PETITION NO. 4 OF 1984

Order on the Application of Sri Narain

...Petitioner

IN RE

Sri Raj Narain Versus Sri Charan Singh.

BY THE COURT

For orders see the judgment delivered in the Civil Misc. Application No. of 1985 in Election Petition No. 4 of 1984 Sri Raj Narain Vs. Sri Charan Singh.

Dated : 21-12-1985.

Sd/-
R. A. MISRA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
ALLAHABAD
CIVIL SIDE
ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

Allahabad, the 21st December, 1985

PRESENT :

The Hon'ble R. A. Misra ...Judge
ELECTION PETITION NO. 4 OF 1985

Order on the Application of Sri Raj Narain
...Petitioner

IN RE

Sri Raj Narain Versus Sri Charan Singh.

PARA 8 OF THE PETITION FILED IN COURT

That the petitioner Claims that the election of respondent is void on the ground mentioned in Section 100(1)(b) and Section 100(1)(d)(ii) (iii) and (iv) of the Representation of People Act, hereinafter referred to as the Act.

Election Petition calling in question any election may be presented on one or more of the grounds specified in sub-section (1) of Section 100 and Section 101 of the Act. Section 100 provides grounds for declaring an election to be void and Section 101 lays down grounds for which a candidate other than the returned candidate may be declared to have been elected. The prayer in the instant petition is for declaring the election of the respondent void without any prayer for declaring any other candidate to have been elected. Section 101 of the Act is therefore not attracted in this petition. Section 100(1) of the Act consists of four clauses to wit (a), (b) (c) and (d) and each Clause enumerates the grounds on which the election of a returned candidate is to be declared void.

In paras 1 to 7 of the petition it has been alleged that the petitioner and respondent along with 17 others persons contested the election of the 8th Lok Sabha from 81 Baghpat Lok Sabha Constituency and that the respondent has been declared elected on 29th December, 1984. In para 8 of the petition the petitioner has asserted that he claims the election

BY THE COURT

Sri Raj Narain has filed an Election petition challenging the election of the respondent Chaudhary Charan Singh in the 8th Lok Sabha Election from 81 Baghpat Lok Sabha Constituency in the district of Meerut in the State of Uttar Pradesh. He has claimed the election of the respondent void on the grounds mentioned in section 100(1)(b) and Section 100(1)(d)(ii)(iii) and (iv) of the Representation of People Act, hereinafter referred to as the Act. Respondent No. 1 Chaudhary Charan Singh has put in appearance and has moved this application for dismissing the Election Petition under Section 86(1) of the Act on ground that the Copy of the Election Petition which has been served upon him along with the notice of the Election Petition is not a true copy as it ought to have been in view of the mandatory requirement under Section 81(3) of the Act. The petitioner has contested this application on the ground that the error is a Clerical error and contains a mere statement of law and does not contain statement of any fact, so, the error could not in any way prejudice the defence of the respondent.

Admittedly para 8 of the Copy of the Petition served upon the respondent is not an absolute exact Copy of para 8 of the petition which has been filed in the Court. I would therefore, like extract both for better appreciation of the significance of the error:

PARA 8 OF THE COPY OF THE PETITION
SERVED UPON THE RESPONDENT

That the petitioner Claims that the election of respondent is void on the grounds mentioned in Section 100(1)(b) and Section 100(a)(b)(ii) (iii) and (v) of the Representation of People Act, hereinafter referred to as the Act.

of the respondent to be void on the grounds mentioned in Section 100(1)(b) and Section 100(1)(d)(ii)(iii) and (iv) of the Act and has thereafter in subsequent paras elaborated these grounds by alleging the facts on which he relies to establish these grounds. Ground 100(1)(b) of the Act finds place in the petition filed in Court as well as in the Copy Served upon the respondent in para 8, and there is no error regarding this ground in the Copy Served upon the respondent.

In the Election Petition filed in the Court Section 100(1)(b)(ii)(iii) and (iv) of the Act is mentioned in para 8 as the other ground on which the petitioner claims the election of the respondent to be void but in the Copy Served upon the respondent, Section 100(a)(b)(ii) and (iv) is mentioned as the order ground on which the petitioner claims the election of the respondent to be void. The Crucial question which now arises for determination is whether the requirement of Section 81(3) of the Act has been substantially complied with in spite of the aforesaid error in para 8 of the Copy Served upon the respondent.

In the Election Petition in para 8 the Petitioner claims the election of the respondent to be void on the ground mentioned in Section 100(1)(b)(ii)(iii) and (iv) of the Act but in the Copy Served upon the respondent he claims the election of the respondent to be void under Section 100(a)(b)(ii)(iii) and (iv) of the Act. Section 100 provides only four grounds to wit (a), (b), (c) and (d) on which a petitioner can claim the election of a respondent to be void. In the Election petition filed in the Court the petitioner has claimed the election of the respondent to be void on the ground mentioned under Section 1(d)(ii)(iii) and (iv) but in the Copy Served upon the respondent there is no mention of Section 1(d). I would like to extract this relevant portion of the Section which reads as below :

“Section 100(1)(d): that the result of the election, in so far as it concerns a returned candidate, has been materially affected—

- (i) by the improper acceptance of any nomination, or
- (ii) by any corrupt practice committed in the interests of the returned candidate (by an agent other than his election agent), or
- (iii) by the improper reception refusal on rejection of any vote or the reception on of any vote which is void, or
- (iv) by any non-compliance with the provisions of the Constitution or of this Act or of any rules or orders made under this Act,

I am unable to agree with the learned Counsel for the petitioner that para 8 of the petition merely contains a statement of law and does not contain statement of any fact. On the other hand I find much substance in the contention raised on behalf of the respondent that this para contains the grounds on which the petitioner claims the respondent's election to be void and it was for the sake of brevity that the grounds have not been written but have been alleged with reference to the Section of the Act which mention the grounds, e.g., instead of saying that 'the petitioner Claims the respondent's election to be void on the ground that on the day of his election the respondent was not qualified or was disqualified to be chosen to fill the seat under the Constitution or under this Act.' One may say for the Sake of brevity that the petitioner Claims the election of the respondent to be void on the ground mentioned in Section 100(1)(a) of the Act. So para 8 contains the grounds on which the respondent's election is claimed to be void by the petitioner, and the grounds on which an election is claimed to be void are statement of facts. It is clear that para 8 of the petition gives grounds on which the election of the respondent is challenged, and contains statements of fact and law both. Subsequent paragraphs of the petition elaborate these grounds and provide material facts to establish these grounds. It, therefore, leaves no room for doubt that para 8 of the petition is most vital part of the petition as it contains the

grounds on which the petitioner claims the election of the respondent to be void

A reading of para 8 of the petition reveals that the petitioner claims that the election of respondent is void on the grounds mentioned in two clauses of Section 100 sub-clause one of the Act, to wit (1) Section 100(1)(b) and (2) Section 100(1)(d)(ii)(iii) and (iv) of the Act. A reading of the Copy of the petition served up on the respondent on the other hand shows that the petitioner claims that the election of the respondent is void on two grounds mentioned in Section 100 sub-clause one of the Act to wit (1) Section 100(1)(b) and (2) Section 100(a)(b)(ii)(iii) and (iv) of the Act. Sub-clause (d) has not been mentioned in Copy and subclause (a) has not been mentioned in the petition; with the result that ground, which has been pleaded in the Copy has not actually been taken in the petition and a ground which has been pleaded in the petition, has not been taken in the Copy Served upon the respondent. These mistakes can neither be characterised as clerical or typographical nor can they be ignored as immaterial or insignificant. On the other hand these mistakes do amount to important omissions and discrepancies of vital nature which are most likely to mislead a man of ordinary prudence and are likely to Cause prejudice to the defence of the respondent. These mistakes are so serious that they shed the very character of a true copy. As observed in *Mithlesh Kumar Pandey Vs. Vidya Nath Yadav and other* (A.I.R.) 1984 S.C. page 305) Section 81(3) of the Act is meant to protect and safeguard the sacrosanct electoral process so as not to disturb the verdict of the Voters. There is no room for giving a liberal or broad interpretation of the provisions of the aforesaid section to ignore such mistakes. In the case of *Mithlesh Kumar Pandey* (Supra) there were allegations of corrupt practices. Schedule I to the Election petition contained the list of persons through whom the corrupt practices were alleged to have been committed. In the copy of the petition supplied to the returned candidate there were mistakes as regards the names of the persons in the aforesaid list, viz. complete omission of some names which were mentioned in the Election Petition but not in the Copy, giving wrong names, and some names given in the petition appeared to be males but in the Copy they appeared to be females. These mistakes in the Copy were held to be vital, seriously prejudicing the defence. In the instant Election petition, the Copy supplies to the respondent omits a ground which has been taken in the Election petition and adds a ground which has not been taken in the Election petition. I am afraid there can be no better Case of non-compliance of the requirement of Section 81(3) of the Act than the present one.

It has been argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that though in para 8 of the Copy ground mentioned in Section 100(1)(a) of the Act appears to have been pleaded yet a perusal of the whole petition shows that this ground has not been substantiated in subsequent paras of the Copy, so an careful reading of the whole Copy, a man of ordinary prudence can discover the mistakes in the Copy. The Court, therefore, should not taken notice of such mistakes. I am unable to agree with this

convention. It is not the duty of the respondent to study the entire petition and correct the mistakes in the Copy. It is the duty of the petitioner to make a substantial compliance of the requirement of Section 81(3) and be extremely careful because non-compliance thereof entails dismissal of the petition under Section 86 of the Act.

It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the mistakes have been discovered at the outset before filing of written statement, so no prejudice in defence has actually been caused and the respondent will not suffer any actual harm if the petition is permitted to survive in spite of the mistake. So the petition should not be dismissed on account of the mistakes in the Copy. This concept cannot be imported into Election Law because Section 81(3) of the Act is mandatory and non-compliance thereof results in dismissal of the Election Petition and in view of the observations *Satya Narain Vs. Durga Ram and Others* (A.I.R. 1974 S.C. page 1185) therein no scope for accepting such a contention :

"The right to challenge an election is a Special right conferred under a self-contained special law and the Court will have to seek answer to the question raised within the four corners of the Act and the powers of the Court are circumscribed by its provisions. An election petition cannot be equated with a plaint in a Civil suit."

It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the mistake in the Copy is not at all mala fide and there was no intention in the least on the part of the petitioner to mislead or cause any harm to the respondent. I am inclined to agree that the facts bearing on the record do indicate that the mistake is not mala fide and there was no intention on the part of the petitioner to cause any harm or mislead the respondent by marking such mistakes in the Copy Served upon. But mensrea is not all a factor to be considered for determining the question of non-compliance of Section 81(3) of the Act. The presence of mensrea would certainly make the matters worse for the petitioner but absence thereof will be of no help to him. Special costs or even punitive costs may be awarded when the mistake is discovered to be mala fide but as observed above the absence of mensrea can neither come to the defence nor can it save the petitioner from the statutory consequence of non-compliance of the mandatory provisions.

In the result I find that the requirement of Section 81(3) of the Act has not been substantially complied with. Therefore the petition is liable to be dismissed under Section 86(1) of the Act.

The petitioner is dismissed under Section 86(1) of the Act non-compliance of the requirement of Section 81(3) of the Act. Under the prevailing circumstances the parties to bear their own costs of this petition.

Dated December 21, 1985.

R. A. MISRA, Judge

नई दिल्ली, 5 मई, 1986

आ.प्र. 99.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 106 के अनुसरण में, निर्वाचन आयोग 1985 का निर्वाचन प्रक्रिया सं. 2 में उत्तर प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय इलाहाबाद के तारीख 6-3-86 के आदेश को एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करता है।

[सं. 82/उ.प्र.—लोक.स./2/85]

आदेश से,

एस. सा. जैन, सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th May, 1986

O. N. 99.—In pursuance of Section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby publishes the Order dated 6-3-1986 of the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad in Election Petition No. 2 of 1985.

s

By Order,

S. C. JAIN, Secy.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
ALLAHABAD

CIVIL SIDE

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

Dated : Allahabad the 6th March, 1986

BEFORE

Hon'ble A.S. Srivastava, J.

Election Petition No. 2 of 1985

Order on the application of Samar Singh—

....Petitioner,

In Ref.

Samar Singh

... Petitioner.

Vs.

Kedar Nath and othersRespondents.

Counsel for the Petitioner : Petitioner in hereon.

Counsel for the Respondents : Sr. S. S. Bhatnagar.

BY THE COURT

By means of this Election Petition filed under Section 81 of the Representation of People Act, 1951 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) petitioner "Samar Singh" son of "S. B. Singh" has prayed that the election of Kedar Nath alias K. N. Singh, respondent No. 1 as a Member of the 8th Lok Sabha from 79-Hapur Parliamentary Constituency be declared void and illegal.

The polling in which respondent No. 1 was declared elected was held on 24-12-1984. The last date for presenting the nomination papers was 27-11-1984. 30-11-1984 was a date for the scrutiny of the nomination papers as well as for withdrawal of nomination papers. Nineteen candidates had contested the election. They were the respondents 1, 6 to 22 and the petitioner. The nomination paper which the petitioner had filed was however not filed in the name of "Samar Singh" son of "S.B. Singh". It was filed in the name of "Samay Singh" son of "S. P. Singh" i.e. both the name and parentage in which the nomination paper was filed did not

correspond with the petitioner's name and parentage. But it corresponded with 'a name' printed in the electoral roll as "Samay Singh". Since the electoral roll did not contain any name as "Samar Singh" the nomination paper which was filed by the petitioner was in the name of "Samay Singh" son of "S. P. Singh". This nomination paper was filed in the prescribed Form 2-A prescribed under Rule 4 of the Conduct of Election Rules 1961 (hereinafter referred to as Election Rules). Before stating any further fact, it will be convenient to reproduce this prescribed Form as under :—

Form 2-A

(See Rule 4)

Nomination paper

Election in the House of the People.

I nominate as a candidate for election to the House of the People from the...Parliamentary constituency

Candidate's name.....Father's/Husband's Name.....

His name is entered at S. No. in Part No. of the electoral roll for

2. (*Assembly constituency comprised within) ... Parliamentary constituency.

My name is and it is entered at S. No. in Part No. of the electoral rolls for

2(*Assembly constituency comprised within).... Parliamentary constituency....

Date (Signature of proposer)

I the above-mentioned candidate, assent to this nomination and hereby declare.....

(a) That I have completed..... years of age;

*(b) that I am (set up) at this election by the... party;

(c) that the symbols I have chosen are in order of preference (i).....

(ii) and (iii).

(d) that my name and my father's/husband's name have been correctly spelt out above in

(name of the language)

I (further declare that I am a member of the.... **caste/tribe which is a schedule **caste/tribe of the State of.....in relation to(area) in that State.

Date(Signature of candidate).

Since this nomination paper was filed in the name of "Samay Singh" son of S. P. Singh, even the petitioner had given the certificate (d) in the above form as under :

"that my name and my father's name have been correctly spelt out above.....".

Thus the nomination paper which was filed by the petitioner was not only in the name of "Samay Singh" but that it also contained his certificate about the correctness of the spelling of his name as well as his father's name as mentioned in the nomination paper. As stated above, this nomination paper fully corresponded with the electoral roll. Therefore, after scrutiny, it was accepted by the Returning Officer. In consequence thereof and after expiry of the period fixed in this regard, the name of "Samay Singh" was brought on the list of contesting candidates prepared in accordance with Section 38(1) read with Rule 10 of the Rules.

In the meantime i.e. on 30-11-1984 Samar Singh filed Civil Misc. Writ No. 16341 of 1984 in this Court for directing the Election Authorities to substitute his name in the electoral roll as well as in his nomination paper in place of "Samay Singh" which, according to him, is incorrect printing of his name. This petition was dismissed in limine on the same day by a Division Bench of this Court by the following order :—

"We are afraid that we have no jurisdiction in the matter. The election process has begun. The matter has to be decided by the Returning Officer, who we are sure, will decide it on merits and in accordance with law. Hereafter if occasion arises, the petitioner may have a remedy by means of an election petition".

On 30-11-1984 the petitioner had moved the Returning Officer also with a similar prayer in which he had also made a reference to the writ petition which he had filed in this Court on that date. It is alleged that the Returning Officer refused to entertain his above application. It has also to be borne in mind that 30-11-1984 was date fixed for the scrutiny of nomination papers. The Returning Officer however, received the petitioner's application on 1-12-1984. On this day i.e. on 1-12-1984 the petitioner made one more application to the Returning Officer with almost a similar prayer. Both these applications were disposed of by the Returning Officer by a single order reproduced below :—

मैंने श्री समरसिंह एडवोकेट द्वारा कोर्ट इलाहाबाद के प्रार्थना-पत्र 1-12-1984 का तथा नाम निर्देशन पत्रों की पत्रावली का अवलोकन किया।

79 हापुड संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से श्री समरसिंह के नाम से नाम निर्देशन पत्र सहायक रिटनिंग आफिसर के समक्ष दिनांक 20-11-84 से 27-11-84 की अवधि में प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है।

दिनांक 27-11-84 को समय 1-13 बजे श्री समरसिंह द्वारा अपना नाम-निर्देशन पत्र सहायक रिटनिंग आफिसर के समक्ष प्रस्तुत किया तथा समय सिंह द्वारा शपथ ली गई। जमानत अंकन रु. 500-00 श्री समरसिंह के नाम से जमा किये गये।

दिनांक 28-11-84 को मैंने नाम निर्देशन पत्रों की जांच की किसी भी उम्मीदवार या अन्य व्यक्ति ने इन नाम निर्देशन पर आपत्ति प्रस्तुत नहीं की, न ही नाम वापसी के दिनांक 30-11-84 तक किसी भी अभ्यर्थी ने श्री समरसिंह के नाम की शुद्धि के सम्बन्ध में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया।

अतः श्री समर सिंह का प्रार्थना-पत्र निरस्त किया जाता है।

The polling was held on 24-12-1984. The ballot paper contained the name of "Samay Singh". The name in which the nomination paper was filed was corresponding to the name printed in the electoral

roll. That is, both in the electoral roll and in the nomination paper name Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh was mentioned. The name Samar Singh son of S. B. Singh was neither mentioned in the electoral roll nor the nomination paper was filed in this name. Admittedly "Samay Singh" son of S. P. Singh is not the name of the petitioner. In that event petitioner Samar Singh was neither an "elector" nor a "candidate" in the said election.

According to the petitioner he is an elector as well as candidate in the said election because the name "Samay Singh" son of S. P. Singh in the electoral roll was a "misnomer" resulting from mis-printing. The nomination paper was, therefore, filed in incorrect name. The name in the nomination paper was also, therefore "misnomer". The petitioner having secured only 617 votes at the poll on account of the ballot paper being printed in the name of "Samay Singh" could not be declared elected.

Sri S. S. Bhatnagar, counsel for respondent No. 1, on the other hand, contended that the name printed in the electoral roll was not a "misnomer" nor was it so treated by the petitioner when the nomination paper was filed on his behalf. The petitioner being "Samar Singh" son of "S. B. Singh" has no right to file this election petition as he was neither an "elector" as defined in Section 2(i)(e) of the Act nor was he a candidate in the election. He urged that Section 81 of the Act permits filing of an Election Petition only by (i) a candidate or by (ii) an elector. Admittedly, Samar Singh who has filed this petition was not mentioned in the electoral roll. He was therefore not an "elector" as defined in Section 2(i)(e) of the Act. He further argued that the person who had contested the election was "Samay Singh" and not "Samar Singh". The nomination paper having been filed in Form 2-A *ibid* in the name of Samay Singh. "Samar Singh" cannot now claim to be a candidate in that election. According to him the name "Samay Singh" son of "S. P. Singh" mentioned in the electoral roll cannot be said to be the result of incorrect-printing. In fact the name printed in the electoral roll is a different name and is not a "misnomer".

The word 'elector' is, as stated above, defined in Section 2(1)(e) as under :—

"elector" in relation to a constituency means a person whose name is entered in the electoral roll of that constituency for the time being in force and who is not subject to any of the disqualifications mentioned in Section 16 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950)".

The words "a person whose name is entered in the electoral roll" leave no room for doubt that the name of a person who claims to be an "elector" of a constituency must be entered in the electoral roll of that constituency. Admittedly the name "Samar Singh" was not entered in the electoral roll on the basis of which the election was held. The name Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh entered in the electoral roll is not the petitioner's name. Therefore, he is not an "elector". The nomination paper was also filed in the name of "Samay Singh" son of S. P. Singh and not in the name of "Samar Singh". Consequently it was Samay Singh who shall be treated a candidate at the election. It was on this account that the petitioner, after the presentation of the nomination paper not in his

name, applied to the Returning Officer to correct his name both in the electoral roll and in the nomination paper by substituting "Samar Singh son of S. B. Singh" in place of "Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh". According to him the Returning Officer was under an obligation to do so because the proviso to Section 33(4) of the Act. He contends that his name being incorrectly printed in the electoral roll did not render his nomination paper invalid though filed in a wrong name corresponding to the name mentioned in the electoral roll. He contends that proviso to Section 33(4) of the Act placed a duty on the Returning Officer to correct the petitioner's name both in the electoral roll, as well as in the nomination paper when this fact was brought to his notice by the petitioner by means of his application.

It follows from the above contentions of both the sides that the petitioner Samar Singh cannot be held to be an "elector" or a candidate under the Act unless it is held that the name in the electoral roll printed as "Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh" and the name in which the nomination paper was filed by the petitioner was a misnomer of such a nature that it could be corrected by the Returning Officer under Section 33(4) at the time of scrutiny.

The meaning of the word "misnomer" has been considered by this Court in Masood Vs. Bikram Singh (A.I.R.1975 Allahabad 402). a case cited by the petitioner, wherein it had been held that "misnomer" really means giving an incorrect or wrong name to a person even in legal document. Therefore, what is to be presently considered is whether the name "Samay Singh" "son of S. P. Singh" mentioned in the electoral roll is really a wrong name printed therein describing no person other than the petitioner "Samar Singh son of S. B. Singh". It is not disputed that till the last date for filing nomination paper, this was not the stand of the petitioner. Even the nomination paper was filed in the name printed in the electoral roll i.e. in the name of "Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh". On presentation of this nomination paper, the Returning Officer had to examine it for satisfying himself whether the name of the candidate and the name of his proposer as entered in the nomination paper were the "same" as those entered in the electoral roll. It is clear from Section 33(4) itself which reads as under :—

"On the presentation of a nomination paper, the returning officer shall satisfy himself that the names and electoral roll numbers of the candidate and his proposer as entered in the nomination paper are the same as those entered in the electoral rolls".

It is evident from the above section that the acceptance or rejection of a nomination depends on satisfaction of the Returning Officer after a comparison of the names in the nomination paper and the electoral roll that the two names corresponded. It is also not disputed that nomination paper of the petitioner was accepted by the Returning Officer after scrutinising his nomination paper as his name as entered in the nomination paper corresponded with the name entered in the electoral roll.

However, it was after the presentation of the nomination paper that the petitioner, for the first time,

took the stand that the name printed in the electoral roll was a "misnomer" and prayed for correction of the electoral roll as well as the nomination paper filed in the name of "Samay Singh". The Returning Officer, while accepting the nomination paper filed in the name of Samay Singh, refused to accept the above contention of the petitioner and grant his prayer.

It is contended by the petitioner that when the question was raised by him before the Returning Officer, he was under a duty to accept his contention and order the rectification of the electoral roll as well as his nomination paper. For this contention, he places reliance the proviso to Section 33(4) which is as under :—

"Provided that the misnomer or inaccurate description or clerical, technical or printing error in regard to the name of the candidate or his proposer or any other person, or in regard to any place, mentioned in the electoral roll or the nomination paper and no clerical, technical or printing error in regard to the electoral roll numbers of any such person in the electoral roll or the nomination paper, shall effect the full operation of the electoral roll or the nomination paper with respect to such person or place in any case where the description in regard to the name of the person or place is such as to be commonly understood and the returning officer shall permit any such misnomer or inaccurate description or clerical, technical or printing error to be corrected and where necessary, direct that any such misnomer, inaccurate description clerical, technical or printing error in the electoral roll or in the nomination paper shall be overlooked."

In order to decide the above contention of the petitioner, the effect of the above proviso on the main section 33(4) to which it is appended will have to be examined. For doing so, it is necessary to advert again to Section 33(4) already extracted above. A plain reading of this Section shows that it does not envisage any enquiry into questions of fact of the above nature at the stage of scrutiny of nomination paper. I do not agree with the petitioner that the decision in Masood's case (supra) has laid down any such law. What has been considered in that case is the scope of proviso to this Section 33(4) in a case where a name printed in an electoral roll was apparently on the face of the materials before the Returning Officer a misnomer. Such a mistake must be apparent that any ordinary man of average intelligence could have easily concluded from the details appearing from the scrutiny of the electoral roll. In that case, the mistake was apparent merely on a perusal of the materials before the Returning Officer. It is evident from the following observations made in that case at page 405 :—

"A comparison of the two electoral rolls which were before the Returning Officer and were actually considered by him together with other material brought to his notice will show that any ordinary man of average intelligence could have easily concluded from

all the details appearing from serial No. 72 to serial No. 81 that the person described at serial No. 76 was Madood and that only his name was wrongly printed as Madood in Ext. P-13 the electoral roll of 1973".

It was in the above circumstances that the proviso to sub-section (4) of Section 33 of the Act was applied to the facts of that case. But the fact of this case is materially different. In this case the materials before the Returning Officer were :—

- (i) electoral roll having no entry in the name of "Samar Singh son of S. B. Singh".
- (ii) It contained an entry in the name of "Samay Singh" son of S. P. Singh" which is not the petitioner's name.
- (iii) The nomination paper filed before him in Form 2-A was in the name of "Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh" and not in the name of "Samar Singh son of S. B. Singh".
- (iv) the nomination paper also contained a certificate signed by the petitioner as "Samay Singh" son of S. P. Singh.
- (v) By this certificate, it was certified unambiguously that the name of the candidate as well as his father's name were correctly "spelt" in the nomination paper.

Unlike the Masood's case (supra), no ordinary man of average intelligence could on the above facts easily conclude that the name Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh was a misprint and a misnomer for the petitioner. For such a conclusion the returning officer had to enter into an enquiry by permitting the petitioner to produce evidence in support of his claim and then making an assessment of that evidence. In other words, such a conclusion was probably not possible on a mere scrutiny of the electoral roll. The question then arises is whether the proviso to section 33(4) envisages such an enquiry by the returning officer at the time of scrutiny of the nomination paper filed before him.

While examining this question it will not be out of place to refer the well settled dictum that ordinarily it is foreign to the proper function of proviso to read it as providing something by way of an addendum or dealing with a subject which is foreign to the main section. The proviso has to operate in the same field. If the language of the main section is clear, it cannot be used for the purpose of interpreting the main section in a manner so as to enlarge its scope or to state a general rule not envisaged by the main section. Rather a proviso is generally added to the main Section to qualifying or to create an exception to what is in the main enactment. The effect of such an excepting or qualifying proviso, according to rules of construction, is except out of the preceding portion of the section or to qualify something enacted therein which but for the proviso would be within it.

The language of the proviso to Section 33(4) is plain enough and leaves no room for doubt about its effect on the main section. It has not the effect of enlarging the scope of main section by providing something by way of addendum. It is also not a quali-

fying proviso. It is of the nature of an excepting proviso by making a provision for enabling the returning officer to direct correction or overlooking of some kinds of mistakes in the electoral roll and the nomination paper which the main section declares to be final for the returning officer at the time of comparing a nomination paper with the electoral roll. As pointed out in Masood's case (supra), mistakes which are apparent to any ordinary man of average intelligence would be attracted by this proviso. But for this proviso, the Returning Officer has no other power to correct it during the conduct of elections. Section 33 is in part V of the Act. Part V deals with "Conduct of Elections". The Returning Officer has to make use of the proviso to Section 33(4) to facilitate the conduct of elections in such a manner that the full operation of the electoral roll is ensured and at the same time, it is not affected by any "misnomer" or "inaccurate description" or "clerical, technical or printing error" in regard to name of any candidate. But it leaves no room for doubt that the description of names is such which is "commonly understood". It is, therefore, evident that the function of the proviso is not to empower a returning officer to take upon himself the task of rectification of an electoral roll depending upon facts which require enquiry or investigation before it is accepted. Such an enquiry during the conduct of election by a Returning Officer is not envisaged in the main section 33(4) and the proviso has also not provided such an addendum to it. The correction envisaged in the proviso must be of the nature described in the Masood's case i.e. must be easily discernable even to an ordinary man of an average intelligence and the correction of which is warranted ex debito justitiae. The word "misnomer" in the proviso cannot, therefore, be given an extensive interpretation as desired by the petitioner.

Thus the proviso relied upon by the petitioner did not empower the Returning Officer to permit substitution of a name in the electoral roll and the nomination paper which was not apparent on a mere perusal of the materials before him, the materials which have already been enumerated of the Constitution or of this Act or of any rules or orders made under this Act."

It is urged by the petitioner that the Returning Officer did not comply with the requirement of proviso to Section 33(4) by refusing to direct the correction of his name in the electoral roll and the nomination paper. Such a refusal to comply with the requirement of the proviso was a breach of statutory duty on the part of the Returning Officer. It has consequently rendered the election of respondent no. 1 void.

As has already been discussed above, the proviso to Section 33(4) has no application in this case. Therefore, the Returning Officer cannot be held to have committed breach of any statutory duty. The above contention of the petitioner cannot, therefore, be accepted and the election of the respondent no. 1 cannot, therefore, be declared void on this ground.

It may no doubt be also urged in this connection that, in case there is no person in the village having the name of Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh i.e. having the name entered in the electoral roll and that this entry is referable to none but the petitioner, then

the petitioner is left with no remedy. Firstly, this contention presupposes following questions of fact :

- (i) there is no person in the village having the name of "Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh" and
- (ii) that the entry in this name in the electoral roll relates to none but the petitioner.

As already pointed out above enquiries into such questions of fact are not within the scope of the proviso to Section 33(4) relied upon by the petitioner. Therefore, he is not entitled to get the election nullified on this ground. However, even if the above facts are assumed for a moment, the petitioner has no claim in equity also because of the very nature of the law of elections. The nature of this law is enunciated by the Supreme Court in Jagan Nath Vs. Jaswant Singh (A.I.R. 1954 S.C. 210 at page 212) in the following words :

"The general rule is well settled that the statutory requirements of election law must be strictly observed and that an election contest is not an action at law or a suit in equity but is a purely statutory proceeding unknown to the common law and that the Court possesses no common law power."

In Jyoti Basu Vs. Debi Ghosal (A.I.R. 1982 S.C. 983) also the Supreme Court reiterated the above decision of the Jagan Nath's case by saying at page 986—that:

"An election petition is not an action at common law, nor in equity. It is a statutory proceeding to which neither the common law nor the principles of equity apply but only those rules which the statute makes and applies. It is a special jurisdiction and a special jurisdiction has always to be exercised in accordance with the statute creating it."

In fact, to use the language of the Jyoti Basu's case (supra) in election disputes, court is put in a straight jacket. The entire election process commencing from issuance of notification calling upon a constituency to elect a member upto the final resolution of disputes is regulated by the Representation of the People Act, 1951. different stages of the process being dealt with different specific provisions of the Act. That being the petition, the above contention of the petitioner can also not be permitted to sustain.

In the result, the petitioner's nomination paper filed in the name of "Samay Singh son of S. P. Singh" cannot be held to have been wrongly accepted by the Returning Officer. He had rightly refused to accede to this prayer of the petitioner to order correction of the electoral roll or the nomination paper at the stage when the nomination papers were being scrutinised by him for preparing a list of contesting candidates in accordance with Section 38(1) read with Rule 10 of the Rules. The petitioner has, therefore, no cause of action to maintain this petition.

The application of the contesting respondent under Order VII Rule 11 C.P.C. is accordingly allowed and the election petition of the petitioner is rejected. There will, however, be no order as to costs.

Dated March 6, 1986.

Sd. A. S. SRIVASTAVA. J

अधिसूचना

नई दिल्ली, 7 मई, 1986

आ. अ. 100—निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट बिहार राज्य से लोक सभा के साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से हुआ है, स्तम्भ (4) में उसके सामने विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन लड़ने वाला प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वर्धन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा उपरक्षित रूप में अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा समय के अंतर्गत और/अथवा अपेक्षित रीति से दाखिल करने में असफल रहा है ;

और उक्त अभ्यर्थियों ने सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी उक्त असफलता के लिए या तो कोई कारण प्रथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है या उनके द्वारा दिए गए अभ्यावेदनों पर, यदि कोई हो, विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्यित्व नहीं है ;

अतः अब, निर्वाचन आयोग उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य/संघ राज्य क्षेत्र की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए आवेदन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

सारणी

क्रम संख्या	निर्वाचन का विवरण	संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की क्रम संख्या और नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले अभ्यर्थी का नाम और पता	निरर्हता का कारण
1	2	3	4	5
1.	लोक सभा का साधारण निर्वाचन 1984 (बिहार)	8-हाजिपुर	श्री कामेश्वर भगत, ग्राम मोकीमचक, पो. पातापुर धर्मपुर थाना - बिबुपुर, जिला-बैथली, बिहार।	लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया है।
2.	वही	वही	श्री सुरेश राम, ग्राम-लखनी, पो. लखनी, बाया-बिबुपुर भाए एस, जिला-बैथली, बिहार।	वही
3.	वही	वही	श्री रमाशंकर भारती, ग्राम छतवाग कपूर, पो० - गाधोपुर तिसमा, थाना-महुआ, जिला-बैथली, बिहार।	वही
4.	वही	17-समस्तीपुर	श्री नन्ध साह, ग्राम पो. मोतीपुर, थाना ताजपुर जिला समस्तीपुर, बिहार।	वही
5.	वही	वही	श्री ब्रिहर प्रसाद शर्मा, ग्राम मलीपुर, थाना, पो. जी. पी. ओ. - पटना बिहार।	वही
6.	वही	वही	श्री राम भजन शर्मा, ग्राम मानकी, पो. भगवानपुर डेमुआ, जिला - समस्तीपुर बिहार।	वही
7.	वही	42-नवादा (अ. जा.)	श्री किशुन रजक, ग्राम पटमौल, पो. - लौद, थाना सिरवना, जिला नवादा बिहार।	वही
8.	वही	वही	श्री पुना मासी, ग्राम मकनपुर, जिला नवादा बिहार।	वही
9.	वही	वही	श्री बालदेव मासी, ग्राम बेलीखार, रामगढ़, पो. औरैया, जिला नवादा, बिहार।	वही
10.	वही	वही	श्री विजय कुमार, मु. नारायणपुरी, (वसिष्ठ धरबाजा) पो. चांदौरा, गया, बिहार।	वही
11.	वही	46-गिरिडीह	मो. उसमान गनी, पो. खांग कोलियरी, जिला गिरिडीह, बिहार।	वही
12.	वही	वही	श्री टेकलाल महतो, ग्राम चितरपुर, पो. तोपचासी, जिला धनबाद, बिहार।	वही

[सं. 76/बिहार - लो. स. /85]

आवेदन से

एस. डी. प्रशासक, अवर सचिव
भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th May, 1986

O.N. 100.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table below at the election to the House of the People held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his name has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses or failed to lodge the account within the time and or in the manner, as shown in column (5) of the said Table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidates have either not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice or the Election Commission, after considering the representations made by them, if any is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column (4) of the Table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State/Union Territory for a period of 3 years from the date of this order.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particulars of election	S. No. & Name of the Parliamentary Constituency	Name & Address of the contesting candidate	Reason for disqualification
1	2	3	4	5
1.	General Election to the House of the People, 1984-Bihar.	8—Hazipur	Shri Kameshwar Bhagat, Vill. Mokimchek, P. O. Panapur, Dharmpur, Thana : Bidupur, Distt. Vaishali, Bihar.	Account not lodg d.
2.	-do-	-do-	Shri Suresh Ram, Vill. Lakhani, P. O. Lakhani, Distt. Vaishali, Bihar.	-do-
3.	-do-	-do-	Shri Rama Shankar Bhatia, Vill. Chatwara Kapur, P. O. Madhupur Jihma, Thana Mahuya, Distt. Vaishali, Bihar.	-do-
4.	-do-	17—Samastipur	Shri Nand Lal Sah, Vill. & P. O. : Motipur, Thana : Tajpur, Distt. Samastipur, Bihar.	-do-
5.	-do-	-do-	Shri Ram Bhajan Sherma, Vill. Malti, P. O. Bhagwanpur Desuja, Distt. Samastipur, Bihar.	-do-
6.	-do-	-do-	Shri Harihar Pd. Sharma, Vill. Salimpur Arra, P.O., G.P.O., Patna, Patna, Bihar.	-do-
7.	-do-	42—Nawada (SC)	Shri Kishun Rajak, Vill - Padmaul, P. O. Laundh, P. S. Sirdalla, Dist. Nawda, Bihar.	-do-
8.	-do-	-do-	Shri Purna Majhi, Vill. Makan Pore, P. S. Warsaliganj (Nawadah), Bihar.	-do-
9.	-do-	-do-	Shri Baldev Majhi, Vill. Belokhar Ramgarh, P. O. Orania, Nawadah, Bihar.	-do-

1	2	3	4	5
10.	General Election to the House of the People 1984—Bihar	43-Nawada (SC)	Shri Bijoy Kumar, Vill. Narayan Chuaba, (Dakhin Darwaja), P. O. Chand Chaura, Gaya, Bihar.	Account not lodged
11.	-do-	45. Giridih	Md. Usman Ghani, P. O. Swang Colliery, Distt. Giridih, Bihar.	-do-
12.	-do-	-do-	Shri Teklal Mahto, Vill. Chiterpur, P. O. & P. S. Torchanch, Distt. Dhanbad, Bihar.	-do-

[No. 76/BR-HP.85]

By Order,
S. D. PERSHAD, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 मई, 1986

आ. प्र. 101.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 21 के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग यह निदेश देता है कि उसकी तारीख 15 अक्टूबर, 1984 की अधिसूचना सं. 434/पं. बं./84(1) में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन किए जाएंगे, अर्थात् :—
उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में

(क) मद सं. 13-बारासत, 14-बसीरहाट, 19-बैरकपोर और 20-दमदम के सामने विद्यमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर "जिला मजिस्ट्रेट, उत्तर 24-परगना, बारासत" प्रविष्टि ; और

(ख) मद सं. 15-जोयनगर (अ. जा.) 17-डायमण्ड हारबर और 18-जादवपुर के सामने विद्यमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर "जिला मजिस्ट्रेट दक्षिण 24-परगना, अलीपौर"

प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी।

— परिवर्तन 1 मार्च, 1986 से प्रभावी माने जाएंगे।

[सं. 434/पं. बं./84 (1)]

आदेश से

धार. पी. भल्ला, सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th May, 1986

O.N. 101.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 21 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby directs that the following further amendments shall be made in its notification No. 434/WB/84(1), dated 15th October, 1984, namely :—

In column 2 of the table appended to the said notification—

(a) for the existing entry against item Nos. 13-Barasat, 14-Basirhat, 19-Barrackpore and 20-Dum Dum, the entry "District

Magistrate, North 24 Parganas, Barasat ; and

(b) for the existing entry against item Nos. 15-Joynagar (SC), 17-Diamond Harbour and 18-Jadavpur, the entry "District Magistrate, South 24-Parganas, Alipore".

shall be substituted.

The above changes shall take effect from 1st March, 1986.

[No. 434/WB/84(1)]

By order,
R. P. BHALLA, Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 मई, 1986

आ. प्र. 102.—निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट लोक सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन, 1984 के लिए जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से हुआ है, स्तम्भ (4) में उसके सामने विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन लड़ने वाला प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा उपर्युक्त रूप में अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहा है,

और उक्त अभ्यर्थियों ने सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी उक्त असफलता के लिए या तो कोई कारण प्रस्तुत नहीं किया है या उनके द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यावेदनों पर, यदि कोई हो, विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्यान नहीं है,

अतः अब, निर्वाचन आयोग उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

सारणी				
क्रम सं.	निर्वाचन की विधिस्थिति	निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की क्रम सं. तथा नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले अभ्यर्थी का नाम व पता	निरहिता का कारण
1	2	3	4	5
1.	लोक सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन 1984	6-अमरोहा	श्री सल्लू, ग्राम तिगड़िया बूड़, तहसील हसनपुर जिला मुरादाबाद, (उत्तर प्रदेश)	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा समय के अंदर व अपेक्षित रीति से दाखिल नहीं किया।
2.	वही	38-गोरखपुर	श्री मखन लाल, उर्फ मखनलाल गोयल, शेवपुर, पोस्ट गीता प्रेस गोरखपुर (उ.प्र.)	निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया।
3.	वही	वही	श्री राजपति, ग्राम बिश्वनाथपुर, पोस्ट अमहिया, जिला गोरखपुर (उ. प्र.)	वही
4.	वही	53-रोबटगंज (अ. जा.)	श्री रोबा लाल, मो. अटवा की पोखरी, पोस्ट महुआरिया, जिला मिर्जापुर (उ. प्र.)	वही
5.	वही	73-आगरा	श्री गिरीज, ग्राम जोमाना, पोस्ट कठवारी, जिला आगरा (उत्तर प्रदेश)	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा अपेक्षित रीति से दाखिल नहीं किया।
6.	वही	वही	श्री राकेश वीक्षित, 9/417, मोती कटरा, आगरा (उत्तर प्रदेश)	वही
7.	वही	वही	श्री बंगालीमल अग्रवाल, 4/360, कबेहूरी बाट, आगरा (उत्तर प्रदेश)	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा समय के अंदर व अपेक्षित रीति से दाखिल नहीं किया।
8.	वही	वही	डा. राजेश्वर प्रसाद मिश्र, जिला मीरान, जमता अस्पताल, आगरा (उ. प्र.)	वही
9.	वही	वही	श्री राम स्वरूप, 46/448, राजाव नगर जगदीशपुरा, लोहा मण्डी बाई, आगरा, (उ. प्र.)	वही
10.	वही	80-मेरठ	श्री अशोक कुमार, 144-मोहनपुरी, मेरठ सिटी (उ. प्र.)	निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया।
11.	वही	वही	श्री अश्वनी कुमार, 310 साहनाथन, मेरठ (उ. प्र.)	वही
12.	वही	वही	श्री ज़िबीराज, 1042/48, बेगम बाग, मेरठ (उत्तर प्रदेश)	वही
13.	वही	वही	श्री दीप चन्द, ग्राम दयालपुर, पोस्ट परीक्षतगढ़, जिला मेरठ (उ. प्र.)	निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया।
14.	वही	वही	श्री मनेन्द्र कुमार महेष्वरी, ग्राम खटीकपुरा, नई बस्ती, जवाहरनगर, मेरठ (उत्तर प्रदेश)	वही
15.	वही	वही	श्री प्रेम चन्द, मोहम्म गल्ल, जिकारपुर, बुलन्दशहर, (उ. प्र.)	वही
16.	वही	वही	श्री अरत लाल, ग्राम व पोस्ट साराबा, जिला मेरठ (उ. प्र.)	वही
17.	वही	वही	श्री महेश चन्द्र, 829, ब्रह्मपुरी, मेरठ, (उ. प्र.)	वही
18.	वही	वही	श्री बाहिव, 411, भो. व्यापारीयान, पोस्ट किशोर, जिला मेरठ (उ. प्र.)	वही
19.	वही	वही	श्री विजयपाल सिंह सागर, 151, भोरंग साहपुर डिग्री, पोस्ट मेडिकल कालेज, मेरठ (उत्तर प्रदेश)	वही

1	2	3	4	5
20.	बही	बही	श्री बिशन स्वर्ण सिंह गुप्तहा, 96, जयनगर, गढ़ रोड, मेरठ (उ. प्र.)	बही
21.	बही	बही	श्री सी. पी. शर्मा, 402, सुभाषपुरी, कंकड़ खेड़ा, मेरठ (उ. प्र.)	बही

[सं. 76/उ. प्र. - लो. स. /85 (5)]

आदेश से,

एस. सी. जैन, सचिव,

ORDER

New Delhi, 7th May, 1986

O. N. 102.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table below at the General Election to the Lok Sabha, 1984 as specified in column (2) held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his name has failed to lodge the account of his election expenses as shown in Column (5) of the said Table, as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And, Whereas, the said candidates have either not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after the notices of the Election Commission or after considering the representations made by them, if any, is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, Therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column (4) of the Table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of 3 years from the date of this order.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particulars of Election	Sl. No. & Name of Constituency	Name and address of the Contesting Candidate.	Reason of disqualification.
1	2	3	4	5
1.	General Election to Lok Sabha, 1984.	6—Amroha	Shri Lallu, Vill. Tigris Bhud, Teh. Hasanpur, Distt. Moradabad, (U.P.)	Failed to lodge the account within time and in the manners.
2.	-do-	38—Gorakhpur	Shri Makhan Lal alias Makhan Lal Goel, Shashpur, Post Gita Press, Gorakhpur (U.P.)	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses.
3.	-do-	-do-	Shri Rajpati, Vill. Vishwanathpur, Post Amhia, Dist. Gorakhpur, (U.P.)	-do-
4.	-do-	53—Robertsganj (SC)	Shri Genda Lal, Moh. Bhatwa Ki Pokhri, Post Mahuariya Dist Mirzapur (U.P.)	-do-
5.	-do-	73—Agra	Shri Girraj, Vill. Jawtana, Post. Kathwari, Dist. Agra (U.P.)	Failed to lodge the account in the manner.
6.	-do-	-do-	Shri Rakesh Dixit, 9/417, Moti Katra, Agra, (U.P.)	-do-
7.	-do-	-do-	Shri Bengalimal Aggarwal, 4/360, Kachehri Ghat, Agra, (U.P.)	Failed to lodge the account within time and in the manner.
8.	-do-	-do-	Dr. Rajendra Prasad Singhal, Tila Maithan, Janata Hospital, Agra, (U.P.)	-do-
9.	-do-	-do-	Shri Ram Swaroop, 46/448, Azad Nagar, Jagdishpura, Loha Mandi, Ward, Agra, (U.P.)	-do-

1	2	3	4	5
10.	General Election to Lok Sabha, 1984.	80—Meerut	Shri Ashok Kumar 144, Mohanpuri, Meerut City, (U.P.)	Failed to lodge an account of election expenses.
11.	-do-	-do-	Shri Ashwani Kumar, 310, Shahnathan, Meerut (U.P.)	-do-
12.	-do-	-do-	Shri Rishi Raj, 1047/49, Begun Bagh, Meerut, (U.P.)	-do-
13.	-do-	80—Meerut	Shri Deep Chand, Vill. Dayalpur, Post. Parikshat Garh, Distt. Meerut, (U.P.)	Failed to lodge an account of election expenses.
14.	-do-	-do-	Shri Narendra Kumar Maheshwari, Vill. Khatikpura, New Bisti, Jawahar Nagar, Dist. Meerut, (U.P.)	-do-
15.	-do-	-do-	Shri Prem Chand, Mohall Gali, Shikarpur, Bulandshahr (U.P.)	-do-
16.	-do-	-do-	Shri Bharat Lal, Vill. & Post Sarawa, Dist. Meerut (U.P.)	-do-
17.	-do-	-do-	Shri Mahesh Chandra, 829, Brahmipuri, Dist. Meerut (U.P.)	-do-
18.	-do-	-do-	Shri Wahid, 44, Moh. Vyapariyan, Post Kithor, Dist. Meerut (U.P.)	-do-
19.	-do-	-do-	Shri Vijaypal Singh Sagar, 151, Aurangshahpur Diggi, Post Medical College, Meerut (U.P.)	-do-
20.	-do-	-do-	Shri Vishan Swaroop Singh Turaha, 96, Jai Nagar, Garh Road, Meerut (U.P.)	-do-
21.	-do-	-do-	Shri C. P. Sharma, 407, Subhashpuri, Kankar Khera, Meerut (U.P.)	-do-

[No. 76/UP-HP/85 (5)]

By Order

S. C. JAIN, Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 मई, 1986

आवेश

आ.प्र. 103.—निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट उड़ीसा राज्य से लोक सभा के निर्वाचन के लिए ओ स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से हुआ है, स्तम्भ (4) में उसके सामने विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन लड़ने वाला प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा उपरिष्ठित रूप में करने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा समय के अस्तर्गत और/अथवा अपेक्षित रीति से बाखिल करने में असफल रहा है:

और उक्त अभ्यर्थियों ने सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी उक्त असफलता के लिए या तो कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है या उनके द्वारा दिए गए अभ्यावेदनों पर, यदि को हो, विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्येय नहीं है;

प्रतः अब, निर्वाचन आयोग उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुकरण में नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य/संघराज्य क्षेत्र की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

सारणी

क्रम संख्या	निर्वाचन का विवरण	संसदीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की क्रम संख्या और नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले अभ्यर्थी का नाम और पता	निरहता का कारण
1	2	3	4	5
1.	लोक सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन, 1984 (उड़ीसा राज्य से)	17 सम्बलपुर	श्री अम्बिका चरन शर्मा पो. बारगढ़ जिला सम्बलपुर उड़ीसा	लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया है
2.	वही	वही	श्री भास्कर बरिहा पो. कनकबीरा जिला सम्बलपुर उड़ीसा	लेखा विधि द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति में दाखिल नहीं किया है।
3.	वही	18 देवगढ़	श्री बिष्णु सेन पो. तालचौर जिला धनकानल उड़ीसा	लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया है।

[सं. 76/उड़ीसा ला.सं./85]]

आदेश से,

एस. डी. प्रसाद, प्रभार सचिव

ORDERS

O.N. 103.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table below at the election to the House of the People as specified in column (2) and held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his name has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses or failed to lodge the account within the time and or in the manner, as shown in column (5) of the said Table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidates have either not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice or the Election Commission, after considering the representations made by them, if any is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column (4) of the Table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State/Union Territory for a period of 3 years from the date of this order.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particulars of election	Sl. No. & Name of Parliamentary Constituency	Name & Address of the Contesting Candidate	Reason for disqualification
1	2	3	4	5
1.	General Election to the House of People, 1984.	17—Sambalpur	Shri Ambika Charan Sharma, At/P.O. Bargarh, Dist. Sambalpur, Orissa.	Failed to lodge any account.
2.	-do-	-do-	Shri Bhaskar Bariha, At/ P. O. Kanakbira, Dist. Sambalpur, Orissa.	Failed to lodge account in the manner required by law.
3.	-do-	18—Deogarh	Shri Bishnu Sen, At/P. . Talcher, Dist. Dhenkanal, Orissa.	Failed to lodge any account.

[No. 76/OR—HP/85]

प्रादेश

भा. प्र. 104.—निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट उड़ीसा राज्य से विधान सभा निर्वाचन के लिए जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में हुआ है, स्तम्भ (4) में उनके नामने विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन लड़ने वाला प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्वीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा प्रप्रेक्षित उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा उपवर्णित रूप में अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा समय के प्रस्तर्गत और/अथवा प्रप्रेक्षित रीति से दाखिल करने में असफल रहा है;

और उक्त अभ्यर्थियों ने सम्यक सूचना दिए जाने पर भी उक्त असफलता के लिए या तो कोई कारण प्रयत्न सन्तीकरण नहीं दिया है या उनके द्वारा दिए गए अभ्यावेदनों पर, यदि कोई हो, विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त अशक्तता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या यायोचित्य नहीं है।

प्रतः प्रत्येक निर्वाचन आयोग उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसरण में नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों की संमद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य/संघराज्य क्षेत्र की विधान सभा प्रयत्न विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

सारणी

क्रम संख्या	निर्वाचन का विवरण	विधान सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की क्रम संख्या और नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले अभ्यर्थी का नाम और पता	निरहूता का कारण
1	2	3	4	5
1.	उड़ीसा विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन, 1985	51-जाटनी	श्री रघुवीर यादव 3 प्रार. 146, यूनिट 9, भुवनेश्वर 7, उड़ीसा	निर्वाचन व्यय लेखा विधि द्वारा प्रप्रेक्षित रीति में दाखिल नहीं किया है।
2.	वही	82-रायागाड़ा (प्र. ज. जा.)	श्री हिमीरीका पद्माचरण ग्राम खिलीमिसुगुडा पो. संतासंशीखाल थाना रायागाड़ा जिला कोरापुर (उड़ीसा)	निर्वाचन व्यय लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया है।
3.	वही	112-सेतापुर (प्र. जा.)	श्री सदानन्दा महानन्दा, पो. विसीमुण्डा जिला बोर्लंगीर (उड़ीसा)	वही
4.	वही	वही	श्री लक्ष्मी प्रसाद बह्रेरा पो. सोनेपुर जिला बोर्लंगीर (उड़ीसा)	निर्वाचन व्यय लेखा विधि द्वारा प्रप्रेक्षित रीति में दाखिल नहीं किया है।
5.	वही	वही	श्री भद्राकु नाग, रंगाकासामण्डा कामासारों जिला बोर्लंगीर (उड़ीसा)	वही
6.	वही	वही	श्री अभिमन्यु बारिक गाटेसरप्रोबारपाया पो. बालांगीर जिला बोर्लंगीर (उड़ीसा)	वही
7.	वही	147-आनन्दपुर (प्र. जा.)	श्री गोलकजीना गांव कनियारी पो. खेनका जिला बर्योझार उड़ीसा	निर्वाचन व्यय लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया है।

[सं. 76/उड़ीसा वि. स./85]

प्रादेश से,

एम. डी. प्रसाद, सचिव

ORDER

O.N. 104.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table below at the election to the Legislative Assembly as specified in column (2) and held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his name has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses or failed to lodge the account within the time and/or in the manner, as shown in column (5) of the said Table as required by the representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidates have either not

furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice or the Election Commission, after considering the representations made by them, if any is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column (4) of the Table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State/Union Territory for a period of 3 years from the date of this order.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particulars of election	S.No. & Name of Assembly Constituency	Name & Address of the Contesting candidate	Reason for disqualification
1	2	3	4	5
1.	General Election to the Legislative Assembly, 1935.	51. Jatni	Shri Raghuvver Yadav, 3 R-146, Unit-9, Bhubaneswar-7, Orissa.	Failed to lodge account in the manner required by law.
2.	-do-	82. Royagada (ST)	Shri Himilika Padmasharan, VIII. Khilimuguda, P.O. Santasishihai, P.S. Royagada, Dist. Koraput (Orissa).	Failed to lodge any account.
3.	-do-	112. Sonapur (SC)	Shri Sadananda Mahananda At/P.O. Bilimunda, Dist. Bolangir (Orissa).	-do-
4.	-do-	-do-	Shri Laxmi Prasad B. hra, At/P.O. Sonapur, Dist. Bolangir (Orissa)	Failed to lodge account in the manner required by law.
5.	-do-	-do-	Shri Mahaku Neg, At Rang-fatamunda, P.O. Kamara, Dist. Bolangir (Orissa)	-do-
6.	-do-	-do-	Shri Abhiminu Barik, Gato Sarobarpara, At/P.O. Bolangir, Dist. Bolangir (Orissa).	-do-
7.	-do-	147. Anandpur (SC)	Shri Golak Jena, Vill. Kanjarl, P.O. Dhenka, Dist. Keonjhar, Orissa.	Failed to lodge any account.

[No. 76/CR-LA/85]

By ord. r,

S. D. PERSHAD, Under Secy.

प्रारम्भ

आ. ध. 105.—निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट विधान सभा के निर्वाचन के लिए जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुना है, स्तम्भ (4) में उनके नामों, विनिर्दिष्ट निर्वाचन लड़ने वाला प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा लड़ने बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा उल्लिखित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहा है ;

और उक्त अभ्यर्थियों ने सम्यक् सूचना दिए जाने पर भी उक्त असफलता के लिए या तो कोई कारण प्रस्तावित नहीं किया है या उनके द्वारा दिए गए प्रस्तावों पर, यदि कोई हो, विचार करने के पश्चात् निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या व्याख्या नहीं है।

अतः अब, निर्वाचन अधीन उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 क के अनुसार में नोबे को सारणी के सम्म (4) में विनिश्चित व्यक्तियों को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की सारणी से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

सारणी

क्रम सं.	निर्वाचन का विवरण	विधान सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की क्रम सं. और नाम	निर्वाचन सड़ने वाले अभ्यर्थी का नाम व पता	निरहिता का कारण
1	2	3	4	5
1.	महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा का साधारण निर्वाचन, 1985	18 जालापुर	श्री सोनार किशन गजपत, स्थान डाकघर खोपोली, तालुक जालापुर, (महाराष्ट्र)	निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे।
2.	वही	29 बिचावी	श्रीमती रेखा पी. गोडमारे, 51/42 बी.डी.बी. बाल, सोरली बम्बई 400018	विधि द्वारा प्रेषित रीति से व्यर्थों का लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया।
3.	वही	43 मलाव	श्री प्रेम प्रकाश भानुस्वरूप उर्फ राजा शर्मा, 45 गोपाल भवन, एम.बी. रोड, मलाव (उज्जैन) बम्बई 400064	निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे।
4.	-वही-	49—कुर्ली	श्री छद्वा रमणिक भीमशी, राम मारुती जोशी बाल, असलका घाट कोपार, बम्बई 4000084	-वही-
5.	-वही-	65—शाहपुर (प्र.ज.बा.)	श्री जाधव बभ्रुकान्त लाहुरे स्थान और डाकघर कासरा, तालुक शाहपुर, जिला ठाणे (महाराष्ट्र)	विधि द्वारा प्रेषित समय के प्रत्येक और रीति से निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया।
6.	-वही-	93—चोपदा	श्री मानुज विनय बागडु, पाटिल गांधि, स्थान, डाकघर और तालुक चोपदा (महाराष्ट्र)	निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे।
7.	-वही-	132—काम्पटी	श्री कान्हेलाथजी, गणपतराव पाटिल, महाबुला (कोरावी परमल) तालुक काम्पटी (महाराष्ट्र)	विधि द्वारा प्रेषित रीति से निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया।
8.	-वही-	139—कटोल	श्री चरन शंकरराव महादेकराव, स्थान बनवाली (केडी) डाकघर विगदास (बी.जे.) तालुक कटोल, जिला नागपुर (महाराष्ट्र)	निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे।
9.	-वही-	142—तुमसर	श्री खाखरबाहे तुमसराम सखाराम, हनुमान नगर तुमसर, (महाराष्ट्र)	वही।
10.	-वही-	143—मडारा	श्री उमाराडे जयराम बानडु, स्थान खामारी बी., डाकघर बारयो, तहसील मोहादी जिला भंडारा (महाराष्ट्र)	वही।

1	2	3	4	5
11	महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा का साधारण निर्वाचन, 1985	159—मद्रावती	श्री यमुनादास बल्लभनी, राव मंदिर बाई, वरोंरा तहसील, जिला 4 पन्ड्रापुर (महाराष्ट्र)	निर्वाचन व्यर्थों का कोई भी लेख दाखिल करने में असफल रहे।
12.	वही	160—बानी	एडवोकेट बालकेश जिलुजी, स्थान और डाकघर, तालुक बानी, (महाराष्ट्र)	वही
13.	वही	164—वरखहा	श्री अमरजधारी उर्फ नीलू बाबू यवतमाल (बाई नं. 24) (महाराष्ट्र)	वही
14.	वही	वही	श्री बगछडे चन्द्रमान अम्बाबाब, यवतमाल (बाई नं. 4 बांयर नगर) (महाराष्ट्र)	वही
15.	वही	वही	श्री लोतोने उदेमान जी तानाजी, स्थान और डाकघर सातेफल, (महाराष्ट्र)	वही
16.	वही	165—दिगरस	श्री जाधो भीमराव लिम्बाजी, स्थान मसहिवीरा, डाकघर कोंबारी, तालुक दिगरस, जिला यवतमाल (महाराष्ट्र)	वही
17.	वही	वही	श्री पांडे श्रीराम मुनाजी, डाकघर और तालुक दिगरस, जिला यवतमाल, (महाराष्ट्र)	वही
18.	वही	वही	श्री बाबूराव देवराव दवाले, स्थान और डाकघर, तनबाड़ी तालुक मनोरा, मला अकोला, (महाराष्ट्र)	वही

[सं. 76/मह./85(वि.स.)]

आदेश से,

बलवंत सिंह, अवर सचिव,

ORDER

O.N. 105.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table below at the election to the Legislative Assembly as specified in column (2) and held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his name has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as shown in column (5) of the said Table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

238 GI/86—4.

And whereas the said candidates have either not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice of the Election Commission, after considering the representations made by them, if any is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons specified in column (4) of the Table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of 3 years from the date of this order.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particulars of election	Sl. No. & name of the assembly constituency	Name & address of the contesting candidate	Reason for disqualification
1	2	3	4	5
1.	General Election to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly, 1985.	18-Khalapur	Shri Shelar Kisan Ganapat, At Post Khopoli, Taluka Khalapur, Maharashtra.	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses.
2.	-do-	27-Shivadi	Smt. R. Jha P. Gotmare, 71/47, B.D.D. Chawl, Worli, Bombay-400 018.	Failed to lodge any account of expenses in the manner required by law.
3.	-do-	43-Malad Shri	Pranprakash Anandswaroop Alias Raja Sharma, 45, Gopal Bhuvan, S.V. Road, Malad (W), Bombay-400 064.	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses.
4.	-do-	47-Kurla	Shri Chhadwa Ramnik Bhimshi, Ram Maruti Joshi Chawl, Asalfa, Ghotkopar, Bombay-400 844.	-do-
5.	-do-	65-Shahapur (ST)	Shri Jadhav Chandrakant Laku, At & Post Kasara, Taluka Shahpur, District Than , (Maharashtra).	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses within the time and in the manner required by law.
6.	-do-	73-Chopda	Shri Salunhe Chiman Dagadu, Patil Gadhi, At, Post & Taluka Chopda, (Maharashtra).	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses.
7.	-do-	132-Kamptee	Shri Kashinathji, Ganpatrao Patil, Mahadula (Koradi Thurmal), Taluka Kamptee, (Maharashtra).	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses in the manner required by law.
8.	-do-	137-Kato	Shri Chavan Shankarrao Mahadearrao, At Wandali (Kd)., Post Digras (Bz). Tahsil Katol, District Nagpur, (Maharashtra).	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses.
9.	-do-	142-Tumsar	Shri Sakharwade Tukaram Sakharam, Humam Nagar, Tumsar, (Maharashtra).	-do-
10.	-do-	143-Bhandara	Shri Uparad. Jayaram Dandu, At Khamari, B., Post Warthi, Tahsil Mohadi, District Bhandara, (Maharashtra).	-do-
11.	-do-	157-Bhadrawati	Shri Jamunadas Yachhari, Ram Mandir Ward, Warora Tahsil, District Chandrapur (Maharashtra).	-do-
12.	-do-	160-Wani	Adv. Balki Ramesh Zitruji, At & Post, Taluka Wani, (Maharashtra).	-do-
13.	-do-	164-Darwaha	Shri Anjandali Alias Neel B. Bho, Yavatmal (Word No. 24) (Maharashtra).	-do-

1	2	3	4	5
14.	General Election to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly, 1985.	164-Darwaha	Shri Wankhade Chandrabhan Ambadas, Yavatmal (Ward No. 4 Bangar Nagar). (Maharashtra).	Failed to lodge any account of election expenses.
15.	-do-	-do-	Shri Sonone Udebbhanji Tanaji, At and Post Satefal, (Maharashtra).	-do-
16.	-do-	165. Digras	Shri Jadhao Bhimrao Limbali, At Melbhora, Post Kondari, Taluka Digras, District Yavatmal, (Maharashtra).	-do-
17.	-do-	-do-	Shri Pande Shriram Gunaji, At Fost and Taluka Digras, District Yavatmal, (Maharashtra).	-do-
18.	-do-	-do-	Shri Baburao Deorao Dawale, At and Post Ratanwadi, Taluka Manora, District Akola, (Maharashtra).	-do-

[No. 76/MT/85 (LA)]

By order,

BALWANT SINGH, Under Secy.

